## THE STATES OF 271 AND UNE-PLATFORM IN THE REGIONAL BELLS' TERRITORIES

Over three months have passed since we last published our report "The Status of 271 and UNE-Platform in the Regional Bells' Territories". Given the recent flood of 271 filings with the FCC and the concomitant changes to UNE-Platform (UNEP) rates made by individual state commissions, we thought it timely to provide an update.

- The flood of applications for in-Region long distance entry under section 271 of the Telecom Act (271) is reaching its crest. Fourteen 271s have been granted to the Regional Bells (RBOCs) so far, and the FCC has applications for seventeen more before it right now: Alabama, Kentucky. Mississippi, North Carolina and South Carolina for BellSouth; Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Nebraska, North Dakota, Montana, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming for Qwest; New Hampshire, Delaware, and Virginia for Verizon.
- By year-end 2002, we expect 271s to cover all BellSouth states except Florida, all Qwest states except Minnesota and possibly Arizona, and all Verizon states. SBC has a good chance of having California granted by year-end, and a slight chance of having Michigan granted as well, with the rest of the Ameritech states likely to slip into the first half of 2003.
- As the RBOCs have prepared to submit their 271s, they and their state commissions have made changes to their unbundled network element (UNE) prices. While commissions do occasionally change UNE prices independently of the 271 process—as New York did earlier this year and as Massachusetts, New Jersey, Texas and Pennsylvania are doing now—most changes have been made as part of the 271 process. Thus, both because UNE rates have been lowered sharply in most states over the last year and because the 271 process is ending, we expect a slower rate of change to UNE prices over the next year or two than we have seen in the last few months.
- The actual implementation of UNEP accelerated in the last few months, as competitive carriers (CLECs) have focused more on this market. WorldCom's MCI division, in partnership with Z-Tel launched its Neighborhood Plan in April. AT&T has added local UNEP-based service in six states to its original two since March of 2002 and will probably add another two states this year. In early 2002, AT&T was offering UNEP-based local service only in New York and Texas. Since March, it has added Michigan, Georgia, Illinois, Ohio, California, and New Jersey. It has indicated that it will also enter Pennsylvania and Massachusetts this year. We expect it to push hard in California, where it will fight hardest to protect its long-distance market. WorldCom's MCI division introduced its Neighborhood plan in April and appeared ready to pursue entry in at least the urban zones throughout most of the country. Entry by these long-distance carriers (IXCs) has been partly in response to potential entry by the RBOCs into the long distance market in a given state and partly in response to lower UNE prices. Given the financial problems at WorldCom and the changes in AT&T's structure and management as it merges its Broadband



unit with Comcast it is somewhat difficult to predict how hard they will push UNEP. We expect some backing off on WorldCom's part, and a harder push in a small number of states on AT&T's.

- At least in theory, the greatest exposure to changes in UNE prices is to SBC AT&T just began deploying UNEP in California, where SBC will not be able to respond on the long-distance side till around year-end 2002, at best. AT&T is also in Michigan. Illinois, and Ohio, where it is unlikely that SBC will be able to respond on the long-distance side till sometime in the first half of 2003. As we indicate below, UNEP discounts are greatest overall in the SBC Region. BellSouth is seeing UNEP-based entry primarily in Georgia and Florida, but AT&T has not yet entered Florida. Florida is the only state in which we do not expect BellSouth to have a 271 till late first quarter 2003. Qwest's rates have recently dropped in a number of states, so that the Regional average UNEP rate has dropped from \$28.21 to \$23.97. However, we do not believe that entry into Qwest's territory is a high priority for the IXCs at any price. Verizon's rate at \$20.23 is the second lowest on a Regional basis, but that rate is relatively stable vs. May of 2002. It is also worth noting that Verizon has not lost much market share since rates in New York were lowered in January. AT&T has indicated that it will enter Pennsylvania and Massachusetts this year, but neither the timing nor the level of effort in those states is clear to us.
- The Supreme Court has affirmed the FCC's right to designate TELRIC (Total Element Long Run Incremental Cost) as the methodology by which UNE prices are set. More broadly, in its May 2002 Verizon Communications v. FCC decision, the Supreme Court appeared to affirm the FCC's right to designate any method other than rate-of-return, which is specifically precluded by the Telecom Act, for the purpose of setting UNE prices.
- The long-term survival of UNEP is, nevertheless, in question. In its May 2002 Verizon decision, the Supreme Court reaffirmed the "necessary and impair" standard, which it had already highlighted in its January 1999 Iowa Utilities Board v. FCC decision. On May 24th, in its USTA v. FCC decision, the D.C. Circuit of Appeals remanded to the FCC the 1999 UNE order in which the FCC attempted to refine the list of required UNEs in accordance with the Supreme Court's "necessary and impair" standard. The D.C. Circuit also vacated the FCC's line-sharing order. The FCC has appealed back to the full D.C. Circuit some aspects of the court's decision.
- All of these judicial decisions will have an impact on the triennial review which was initiated by the FCC in December of 2001 to decide which UNEs still meet the "necessary and impair" test. The triennial review was expected to conclude this year. If the D.C. Circuit does accept the FCC's appeal, we believe it is unlikely that the FCC will issue an order in the triennial review till after the court rules, most likely some time next spring. Aside from delaying the conclusion, the various court decisions are likely to drive the FCC toward a more granular analysis than it had done in the past. That was the bent of the current FCC anyway, but the D.C. decision reinforces it. For example, we would not be surprised to see switching removed as an element in some

markets fairly quickly and in others over some longer transition period. Other elements also might be removed over time in some geographic and customer markets. If the FCC decides to take granularity down to the wire-center level, it may leave actual implementation in the hands of the states, but with fairly tight rules to guide that implementation. In the context of UNEP, what is significant about the removal of an individual element is that it makes it necessary for the CLEC to do some work to reassemble the line when it inserts its own equipment. That will make it more difficult to move large numbers of customers rapidly. Thus, the timing and outcome of the triennial review is very important both to the CLECs/IXCs who use UNEP and to the RBOCs who are wholesaling lines to those CLECs/IXCs at deep discounts.

- The actual financial impact of UNEP on either the RBOCs or their competitors is, of course, what investors care about. Unfortunately, it is difficult to quantify because it depends so much on the companies' strategies. The more CLECs are able to cream-skim in a given market, the better their own margins and the greater the damage to the RBOC. The CLECs' ability to cream-skim, in turn, depends not only on the CLECs' own strategies, but on the RBOCs' win-back efforts, which often include the introduction of new pricing plans and the RBOCs' ability to offer all-distance plans. Thus, damage to the RBOCs' financials comes not only from the conversion of retail revenues to wholesale revenues, but from a broader repricing in response to competition. The offset from long distance appears to be fairly minor, at this point. Although ultimately all-distance customers may be "stickier" than those who use only one service, initially both sides are likely to spend more on marketing to fight churn than they did before.
- Our May 1, 2002 report included one effort at such an analysis. It found that UNEP creates a discount of about 19% to 42% below retail residential revenue. Using the same retail rates, those discounts would now range from 24% to Another way to look at the issue is to use the FCC's rate reference book, which relies, in turn, on TNS bill-harvesting data. According to this data, average residential spending per household on local service is \$426 per year and on long-distance \$176 per year. Assuming 1.2 lines per household, that would equate to about \$30 per line in local revenue plus about \$4 per line in access charges for a total revenue per line of about \$33-\$34. That figure falls within the range of \$30-\$34 for retail consumer revenue that we had estimated in May, although both calculations present potential problems. For the TNS data, specifically, it is not clear whether taxes and Universal Service Fund contributions which an RBOC would simply pass through to the government are included in the revenue. With that caveat, we are using \$33.50 as a national average residential rate. That leads to UNEP discounts on a Region-wide basis of 27% in BellSouth, 28% in Qwest, 48% in SBC, and 40% in Verizon. The TNS numbers also indicate that the RBOC would need to gain more than three long-distance customers to make up for the revenues from any local customer it loses (\$474 of local plus access revenue vs. \$128 of longdistance revenue net of access). And-given the different margin structures of the industries--it needs more than that to make up for the lost cash flow. Of course, to the extent that an IXC can capture small business customers whose

retail spending is higher than that of consumers, the damage to the RBOC is greater. For some time, at least, while the industry restructures itself into an "all distance" market, the UNEP vs. 271 game is likely to be "negative-sum," with both the RBOCs' and IXCs' profits hurt by lower revenue and higher marketing costs.

#### APPENDIX

#### So astukyon Chayran saho UNI Pi Robert, MAY 100 A 300 St. 2002

Changes in methodology and corrections of errors:

- We changed our MOU (minutes of use) assumption from 1200 to 1411, to account for toll minutes, based on footnote 252 of the FCC's Pennsylvania order.
- For the columns that calculate full UNEP based on DEM (dial-equipment minutes), there is no change. Thus, for comparison, we are showing full UNEP based on DEM for both May and August in our tables.
- We corrected an error in the formula that calculated amortized non-recurring charges for Verizon's MA, NH, NY, DE, PA. For NV, KS, MO, OK and TX, we now have some non-recurring charges that we did not have in our last iteration. For Maryland, we are no longer using the compliance rates that we used in May. Statewide loop rate averages changed in several BellSouth, Qwest and Verizon states, though the actual rates did not, based on new estimates of the distributions of lines per zone: KY, LA, MS, SC, NM, ME, RI, PA.
- Once we assemble our data, we ask all the relevant state commissions. RBOCs and the two major IXCs to comment on its accuracy. We received specific feedback on the accuracy of our tables from all the RBOCs and many states.

#### Some of the state of the same

- UNE prices continue to trend down.
- For all RBOCs the full UNEP average (assuming DEM) dropped by 10% from that which we reported in May.
- On a national basis, full UNEP average (assuming DEM) now stands at \$20.28 vs. the \$22.58 average we reported in May.
- The range is a high of \$24.38 for BellSouth and a low of \$17.50 for SBC, within the range we predicted in our May report.
- SBC experienced a roughly 20% decline (with an even sharper decline in California) and Qwest experienced a roughly 15% decline in full UNEP (DEM) average since our May report.
- The RBOC-wide total switching and transport average dropped 21%, from the \$8.34 we reported in May to \$6.59 in August.
- Several states' full UNEP (DEM) price appear to increase or actually increased from that which we reported in May. In some cases, as noted above, we changed the non-recurring formula. In some cases we changed the distribution

of loops among zones, thus changing the average. In a few cases, rates actually rose. In AL, FL, LA, MS and SC, there is now a cross-connect charge that is part of the non-recurring charges that we amortize. In Oregon, the port rate increased slightly.

- Anna Maria Kovacs, Ph.D., CFA

- Kristin L. Burns, Ph.D.

Gregory S. Vitale

## COMPASIES MENTIONED IN THIS REPORT

Company Name	Symbol	<u>Price</u>
BellSouth	BLS	\$25,44
SBC	SBC	\$27.89
Qwest	Q	\$2.82
Verizon	VZ	\$31.18
AT&T	T	\$11.79
WorldCom's MCI	WCOEQ	\$0.12
Z-Tel	ZTEL	\$1.44
Comcast	CMCSK	\$22.99
Dow Jones Industrial	DJIA	8,887.87
S&P 500 Stock Index	SPX	941.06

## SOOMALUE STATE OF THE SECOND CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR STATES SECOND CONTRACTOR SECOND SEC

	AU I			73 68 3 M	69-95 AM	52.58 5.74	00 0 <b>\$</b> Hä	00 0 <b>\$</b> -}(1	5 L Z (\$ -5 AV)	A W	4.M
	42111			XS TGS	28 028	ë 8 6 l <b>5</b>	69.67	99 05	osti	70 rt3	70 trs
HEL VELVALIC K <sup>ek</sup>	ais V, Hor	681'57	%15	56'715	11.65	S1 '45	FZ U\$	77.05	11/775	75 075	61 613
	21812			A.N	AN	AN	F1,7,13F	17.18	AN	AN	AN
	W 0.1			67 115	17.95	65.55	±0.05	10.05	86 Z L \$	L! / I\$	53 L (3
	21412			ÜN	V K	1.5	HN	HN	VW	VW	II.N
	- dhift			01.817	16 715	#5 D L\$	91 05	81 (1)	80 85 <b>5</b>	ë₽ >ë\$.	LL 673
AAMEX Beb	3AV 001	181,91	%1†	76.715	£1/85	78'95	1 1 05	71.05	81 175	58 615	91 UZS
	21812			ÚN	V2.	Va	.)()	DC.	(N	IN .	(3)
	# n. l			čs 6 <b>5</b>	( p. 95	50.58	00.03	00.0\$	\$1.41 <b>\$</b>	r: >15	P   5 ( \$
	ज्ञांसड			M 1.	Æ.T.	XM	30	34	ÁM	Δ 16	Δ.Μ
	d≱iH			85 765	28.00\$	21 6 I S	69.0\$	99.8\$	c5 5 <b>75</b>	24 t 05	244 05
Acrion ide Avg.		11,927	% 11	16715	69. R.?	21.72	61.02	81.02	28.152	17.078	18.912
	state			N.	23 XV	8.8	980	ON	яV	K.5	8.9
	□ D. I			60 113	> <i>t</i> → <b>5</b>	91.58	£0 0 <b>5</b>	2 6 0 5	£ (-07 <b>\$</b>	09.61\$	61 613
	21812			30	30	90	30	30	30	ЯО.	ЯО
	- 4×111			.7.515	5 P. N.S.	108\$	£1.15	01 15	ts 57 <b>5</b>	£0.52 <b>5</b>	\$54.8K
2# BE B €5		967'-1	%0x	15 + 15	£L'95	62.95	01.12	20.12	†1'77S	19/175	FS 178
	State			V)	<b>V</b> .)	V.)	AN VO	AN 'VO	V,3	V,1	V.)
	was i			10.63	11.48	tr >\$	80.05	80 05	87.012	91 515	Lrics
	21412			AS	λN	AN	AN 'VO	AN 'Və	AN	AN	AN
	daill			65 (IC)	tilly	20.015	80.05	30 OK	18 L1\$	19.017	PS 01 \$
FACTOR BELL Reg	- avy 000	100 61	% tt	\$1.015	06.52	15.88	80.02	80.02	CF248	11.212	+5'LZ\$
	31415			DO.	NI	NI	,NI	NI	NI	N1	IM
	MPT			10.25	>8 : \$	LUAS	10.05	£0.0\$	01.015	S0 215	05 913
	21612			111	<u>L#</u>	LA	131	T ¥	<u>1.w</u>	Г₩	1.4
	dgiH			96 915	70.118	1   0   5	96 cY	EX CS	10 575	28754	>8 1 7 8
ZZERTIERH K <sup>O</sup>	= asy nor	TER. LS	%- 81	17.65	71'95	F6'SS	59.07	82.02	87.412	SUSIS	71.915
	31415			HO	NI	NI	N	NI	<b>N1</b>	NI.	11X
	** (			10 78	> N + 2 >	16.33	7.0 02	CO 10\$	ne cl\$	S0 č1 <b>S</b>	05 7 15
	21412			1.5	18	11/11	1 1/1	H	17	VS	YN
	datti			5 0G	PELIS	1.1075	00 č\$	(8.7)	f8 i t \$	£4.07.7	F5 015
3. V abi mpuiga		811,82	7, üt	10/115	59.97	16'85	69.68	22.07	08.812	05/213	15 175
	91812		_	1.1	WA	IVN	N1	X1	1:1	1.1	ЯО
	Wo.L			10.115	t Coh	TP T5	81.02	81.02	V9 DC\$	44.008	LITTE
	31K35			138	GS	ΟŚ	40	AO.	LIX.	UN	1 M
_	43([]	<del></del> _		8h Ec\$	213 33	5 i 0 ( <b>S</b>	> 05	07.02	56.715	T9 FL\$	86 61 \$
Reginnalde Avg		196.71	%71	09.918	\$\$'4\$	46.48	11.02	50.40	151 28	Lbils	15.852
<del></del>	State			V O	NT	NI	R.A.	SW	NI	.81	NI
	AND E			55 715	05.75	11.55	56 B	8118	81 61\$	88.058	06 B C \$
	31815			SIN	ЭN	YO	1.4	1-1	SIN	SIA	TV
	43:11			It ics	87. 72	£1 K2	1918	1133	PE 663	.8 678	60 913
ill Regions ide Ave.	_	74,052	7441	71:515	76'55	56.95	19/15	10.52	16.118	81 175	90.978
	RROG			OHS	878	SBC	//	/.\	.MS	Dits	ZA
	44 0.1			10 115	56 ss	16.55	61.05	81.05	01 815	05 Z4 <b>5</b>	186(\$
	DOUB			ō	73	ŋ	2.10	839	$\rho$	7.18(	ሽ
	48(1)			09.91\$	CE 82	16.95	[412	10 75	8× t č\$	81.128	£58.53
e, All RHOCS		870,211	%-001	F0 C13	87.77	65'95	29.05	99.0\$	16.021	87 07 \$	82.552
				SL MNI 3 44		018:18	SIVI			STVIOL	
					estenim yniteniyi io	MAC 25 muzzi 25 tunun	11kl zomused. eolunim gailknigten	Mil (Leomice) robunim	) († † 1 2 m 1122 † estunim yhteniyiso	lf 141 20 murs L estudia	4 (Leomues A estunim
togero (A abi maniga)i		(9000) SANE 884 ) 3V	\$4841 \$54.00V	(Atnom	(Brown) (Brown HT	(dinom ing)	քզյուստ	†qjaom rod) XHILO IJV	DNITS NEW HALL	OSHIVATING TAD	DVSINATI

SOURCE Company Francial reports and regulators filings including lardles interconnection agreements and ARAMS reports: (CAM estimates

<del></del>	31018	(N		Vd	Vd	yy puo sjuəinəəzili VA	)(I	DC.	V۸	ſŊ	(8.40.50	AWINDO	.)(1
	wo.l	25.05	12.05	208100 05	\$ 19 too u \$	191000 01	on o\$	00 o <b>s</b>	12 0 <b>5</b>	91.0≸	00 U\$	00.0%	416-1
	37815	N. C.	10	7.W	$\overline{\Lambda . M}$	50	7.W RI	<u>\( \Delta \) \( \</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>\(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\lambda}\)</u>	$\overline{m}$	ĐE	A.M
	42114	85.12\$	10.25	\$48800 n¥	009500 p\$	969000 0\$	± 1 0\$	El u\$	86.0\$	02.0\$	9 <u>1</u> 1\$	95.0\$	LLCC
141 A11 AVIIC Region A		56 (15	51-15	FF 1 1 0 0 0 5	105700'05	£\$Z000°0\$	60.02	90'85	9£'05	£0 \$	22.02	91.05	1,842
A 311 AA 11A 144	Sizie	A.V.	ILS	AN	3.N	AN	AN	AN	AN	λN	VWTIN	13/18	VW.
	M0	61:11\$	12.0\$	2r1106 a\$	111100 0\$	825000 B\$	00.0\$	00 0\$	20 B2	1941≸	00.0\$	00.03	DER.I
	77715	HN	3.8	LA	EX	VN	11.8	HN	VW	VW	134	VW	IΔ
	nge11	96.00\$	45 2 <b>5</b>	£0.001.00 0\$	\$00100 a\$	015100.0\$	11 115	51.05	4131	59 T <b>\$</b>	LE 0\$	510\$	5,009
INDEX NAME		50.512	FZ Z\$	75×100 08	F## LOD 65	278000.02	£0.08	£0 05	PZ'15	56.0\$	£1 11%	60'05	804 1
	21815	fN	113	3.5	3.7	VA	PADG	OU AN	$V\Lambda$	(N	ALAMA DC DE	10, UV J. 300	м
	₩0.I	25.65	1. 0\$	, t   100 ms	111100 64	29 (Map 0 <b>\$</b>	## 0\$ 0	00 0\$	€2 0 <b>\$</b>	9 E 0 \$	00.0\$	មួយ មន្ត	li t
	31815	A.W	રમ	A.A.	H,L	Vw	117	HN	Viv	ŸЖ	aw	40	λM
	Чã!Н	85 1.5	28.73	848800 02	229500-03	015100 0\$	11.05	>t 0\$	LI č\$	59.1\$	91.1\$	95 0\$	11: i
gree, obi mnoigs Hind		16.514	67.17	5,5100 05	661200 45	£25000:01	90.02	\$0.03	FZ:05	95.02	07:05	£1.02	178,1
auf ali annina H no	31815	av	AR KS	7B K5	SA BA	X i	ÜΝ	OK	XI	X1	£-11	8.1	54
	<b>~</b> o.1	OR 1 13	19.15	06; 100 05	061 (00 of	662000 0\$	90 O <b>\$</b>	00.03	€P 0\$	83: O\$	00.05	81.05	HTC.
	ATEIS	90	XT	NO.	40	80	ARASZON, UX	ЯV	30	ÓΡ	e, a	40	нv
	43:H	1± 51\$		65 (CHO 03	65 U - 00 U\$	\$0.000184	90.1\$	c0.1 <b>\$</b>	n9 D\$	t9 ( <b>)</b> \$	00.0\$	(1.05	NE'L
SWB 1 R9E		15 FIS	80.75	889100 05	RE9 100'85	SEEDOO'05	6H.07	18 05	20.49	tt'0\$	00°8\$	17 05	LETT
2. g 1 g 1g2	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	V I	V )	V )	1 )	V )	e u	P-tr	V.)	V.)	AN	AN 'VO	ΛN:
	wo j	20.05	88 P\$	085 (00 0%	08: 100 04	¥1.6000.0\$	e u	v u	11-15	80.08	00 H\$	80.03	98. 1
	31815	ÁN	AS	AN	VA.	A N	E U	ę, u	AN	ΔŃ	V.)	$\Delta N^{2}V^{3}$	V)
	daile	. S 0 € \$	19.15	012100.0\$	019100-05	X0≠500 0 <b>\$</b>	e u		19 48	<u> </u>	U6 8\$	¥0.0\$	1:1811
		\$1.015	06.02	7RF 100 05	28# 100 DS	450100.02	00 05	80.83	9t 15	40°1\$	88.02	80.07	£18'1
PACIFIC BLLE Reg	11E12	Ho	IIX	NI II	NL II	IIS	71	NI	IIV	DN	0.0	וא	11
	wo.1	10.2\$	15.3	опанно u <b>s</b>	<b>1</b> 0 ононо	¥150000\$	2n 0 <b>\$</b>	10.0\$	LL 10\$	85.0\$	tr-u	10.05	1971
	37515	1.%	1.86	J.W.	1.W	1.8	1.\	HÓ	EW.	1.86	e-(f	1 4/	HÓ
	ųZ) H	06.013	5. 91	612100-0\$	611100 03	£\$2160 0\$	11.05	Z 2 O \$	94.15	91 13	eju	25.5	790.5
		17.63	02.13	921000.05	95,1000,03	018000 03	LT 05	07.05	1113	88.02	00.02	R£ 05	906 I
VZG KITLU II K <sup>GE</sup>	- 31612	11.63	1.)	NI II	NI II	X I	OWANYO	ON AN VII	X1	XI	LW/IW/HO/NE II	41	H
	#0 [	10\$	88.05	инивно ну	000000 <b>0\$</b>	660000 0 <b>\$</b>	60.0\$	nu n\$	ct 115	8 t (15	00 D\$	10.03	£94.1
	21872	<u>78</u>	1 <u>4</u>	30	40	$\overline{\Lambda}\overline{\Lambda}$	28' F2'6FTZ	NV	3.4	<u> 7.9</u>	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	<u>1 M</u>	ਸ਼∨
	AgiH elei2	- č≤ 0₹ <b>\$</b>	>લું <sup>9</sup> \$	657200.0\$	652.00 U\$	801500 0\$	90.15	€0.1\$	19 4\$	:> >\$_	06.0\$	<u>د ی</u>	981 E
	4*:11	£67.15	61.25	051100.05	051100-05	917.000.03	95.02	20 35	S0115	18 05	62.03	17.05	179,1
gr.f. abi maniga A	31616	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	N.N.	VI	VI	WN	. NN	VDV (II VI O.)	NIX	US
	wo I	21:214	26.05	000000 0\$	000000 o <b>\$</b>	1.2000 0\$	00.0\$	00.0\$	20 14	18 03	00 OS	00.0\$	2,000
	State	IN.	3.8	ds	as	NW	MO'ON'NW	UN	NW	NIA	11	ЯO	d۸
		80 E \$	59.7 <b>\$</b>	944FD0 0 <b>2</b>	691:100.0\$	101100 03	61.05	96.0\$	18 15	99.1\$	92.1\$	92.03	16 :
	dgi H		- <del></del>	187 100,62	167 100.02	950100'05	05, 02	87 04	98'15	71.12	20.40	£1 05	777
gyf, abi neniga lite	21215	09'915 V()	3.3	1/2 140 43	IV	10	).N	SIX	IV	IV	ALCV RELA	3.9	SIN
		55 E1\$	51 IS	£02000.0\$	10.000.03	801-000 OS	88.03	\$1.03	35 US	10 KG	UU U\$	90.0%	54.0
	wo.1	SÑ	.38	V1	V I	ÀN	71	ÌЭ	14	ĀÑ	11	DN.	Ý9
		et ics	.75 UNIT\$	808100 0£	898100.03	£0.000 0\$	51 c¥	TO 25	01.4\$	9E 18	923\$	£. 0\$	45 8
	dsiH			151100.02	151100.03	215000°05	91-15	98.15	£1.05	20.93	19'05	F 11(F\$	91'6
avf. 2bimgotas Aug.		71:515	6715	31100.03	31100 03 31S	2.18	73	ZA	5 18	ZA	ZA	7Α 'δ	ZΛ
	BBOC	DHS	1) 	054100.0\$	.905 051100 04	215000 0 <b>\$</b>	40 0 <b>%</b>	50.0\$	16.05	95.03	01 0 <b>5</b>	E 1 10%	78.1
	₩U']	у так То 41 <b>3</b>	)HS	7A	/A	5	S DU	\$ 191	ñ	ð	5.10	015	î î ii
	DON			881,0005	50 HG1 1 66	AF0100 H <b>₹</b>	91.13	48 13	91:15	ck IS	19 03	15.03	1911
	dailt.	09 91\$	ni ,1	£99100.07	ZES100'05	549000 03	SE OS	81.02	50.05	28.02	££'0\$	41.05	1417
SOOBBILL STREET	_	10 (15	20.75	SI TANE CAN	7131M0 02	22,11,0 (1)	2. 1/3	J. 9.		STV.LO.L			
	-1						jili samasež gnilangito zelužum	esumerk estuaim ICAA	<del></del>	PAG ramores zalunin			•
Pograech ablemunias 1		(bet moutp) 1 OOJ B 4.E.E.	PORT RATE	3mH8M3tio fabo 1 tog) AZIM M11 W2 ( IQIK	[820 ]   DNIH.) H WS   (JOP 204)	CIOR TRANSFORT (ber SWITCHISO VAR OLHER	(d) (per	ान्त्री मुख् (प्रमण्डा	gnidəting vədset Tioqena (f. hna (dinom 194)	gordati ed 14410 Iroqeneri bre chinom 1941	4411434 COST (pre- (dinom	AMORIIZED	TVIOI pail 1543 inom

### | 1909 | 1 дострой (1904 | 1909 | 1909 | 1909 | 1904 | 1904 | 1904 | 1904 | 1904 | 1904 | 1904 | 1904 | 1904 |

LERWIJN ALING VND LERWIJN VLING LERWIJN VND LERWIJN VN	DEBRICATION AND PETER STATES	DNITVSHARI ORODVEYCHO ELT ONES	aod) HAHLO TIV	छन्) म नगाउन १,४४ (ब्रह्मल्ल	18775PORT (per 18775PORT (per 10174	TOTAL SWITCHING AND TRANSPORT (per month)	रञ्जा ५ <i>१७५</i> सं प्रस्ता । स्रहेतकमा	\$4NEE\$\$4.03V 1V40130 %	(000) 8.4X[1] 88.4.3 3X	S (NOZ CHSNJQ	गार
te 4 (Leounee A estunim	is del romperé estanies	1144 somuzeA. sotunim gnitanigiro	MAN tomurs/ sotunim	illet ramues? rainnim gnitsnigito	IAA (Leomure A estanim	ftk) somuszA. rolunim gartknigisa		•			
*****	SIVIOL				OTRIS		L IdNE CIN				E m s d s
60 913	55 EUS	82 208	1015	20 l <b>s</b>	9r.5\$	55 F\$	55 [1 <b>5</b> 99 <b>915</b>	468	Cto.	l 8a√	g pa w
							TO 015			ī	
		- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1					59 115			1	
81 97\$	17.58	EC TCS	11 15	10 28	55.9\$	10.95	55 515	*.LZ	<b>#</b> 1579	ĭ ₩AV	g bi a
							68 51 <b>5</b> 77 11 <b>5</b>			î I	
							07 07 <b>2</b>			ì	
18 1 (3	18 125	1000\$	£5 21	14.13	£1.8\$	14.95	55 215	Mar I	51170	MAY	signo
							4r 213 08 015			i I	
							18615		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	t	
91.175	8H > 2\$	95168	60 f \$	66.0\$	£5, 9 <u>\$</u>	12.53	95.113	3,7	1123	MAY	A yan pu
							19.63			i I	
							65 02 <b>5</b> 21 <b>715</b>	•		t .	
1153	21.505	10265	46.15	50.15	1815	1995	#£ 915	e "D.)	ISEL	ā vy	ensitio
							(L + 18)			1	
							タビ おかち おも こころ			t C	
Cant	c8 fics	71.6cS	8.15	20.15	8: 42	96.55	.11.5		4.1	ic.v	iqqıreir
							86.018			:	
							16.515				
							*** ET\$ ****			t t	
00 / 55	60 x d3	911 CC\$	73.18	otis	£3.64	87.42	81 715	(۱۱,۷	E/T.	ĕιγ	spilets ) dlt
							\$2.048			ι	
							33 915 50 615			1	
16 963	85 975	7/175	9815	80 i.Z	i 8 9 <b>\$</b>	51.95	15.915	- <sub>6</sub> 4	977.	avA.	suilare) d)
							97.3.15			1	
							81.072			ì	
06.015	88 00\$	81 6(2	NF 15	/ 0   <b>S</b>	18.55	64.70	21 mis mosts	4.11	# C 9 C	73.4	3322341
							81 - 15			1	
							25 105 15 915			į	

Source, Company Financial reports, and regulatory filings including tariffs, interconnection agreements and ARABS reports, CCMI estimates,

	-
	-
	-
	(
	1
	-
	Ξ,
	2
	-
	7
	_
	۲.,
	7
	-
	_
	1
	-
	_
•	_
	-
	7
	<u> </u>
	_
	_
	=
•	٠
	~
4	_
	_
-	,
_	
-	-
	-
-	-
٠	
-	•
	_
	_
-	-
- 1	
Ξ	
1	
-	1
_	1
-	ł
	Į
_	Ţ
	ı
	ı
_	l
	ſ
-	ı
	1
	ı
- :	
=	ı
-	

	•												
	SIA1E	LOOF RATE (per month)	r PORT RALE (per-	10f AL ORBGINALING SWITE HING (per MOE)	LOCAL BERMATING AWITCHING per MOU	OTHER SWITCHING AND TRANSPORT (per MOU)		Pt't (per month)	Other Switching and Transport (per month)	Other Switching and Transport (per month)	PFALLER COST	AMOR IZED	TOTAL DEN Per line, per Real
							Assumes [41] eriginating menutes	Assumes DEM manues	Assumes 1413 originating monutes	Assumes DFM Whates			
	Afabataz	77.75		KF1 INFL 15					7				
		\$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00		<b>CO</b> (OBL 20 &	אַנון חווח אַנ	Se entrans	C-15	\$ 5 \$ 7	\$0.58	\$0.80	;	. Se 13	1117
41 In String List         String List         Value         Valu	forida	\$11.55 \$11.75 \$11.80 \$10.76	5117	S0 (fac: 1 <sub>e.e.</sub>	432 mm 38.	Strands	4.3	V: 44	50.31	\$0 % ¢	\$ 26	EL 19	9,960
C1 b.         Grintled         Cumitsd.         Cumitsd. <t< td=""><td>* corpla</td><td>\$12.55 \$10.80 \$12.47 \$1483</td><td>6<i>i</i> 13</td><td>V0 001 p. 3.3</td><td>Snonless</td><td>\$0 d00550</td><td><b>1</b>1 KK</td><td>£2.40</td><td>\$0.79</td><td>8113</td><td>\$tt na</td><td>11 03</td><td>1,574</td></t<>	* corpla	\$12.55 \$10.80 \$12.47 \$1483	6 <i>i</i> 13	V0 001 p. 3.3	Snonless	\$0 d00550	<b>1</b> 1 KK	£2.40	\$0.79	8113	\$tt na	11 03	1,574
C1 12         Grant/Red         Valuation         Statution         Value         Statution         Statut	entucky	\$17.56 \$9.64 \$13.47 \$40.86	(1)	So <b>d</b> olle?	<b>CB</b> 004 15.7	Su nad28.2	Kin ex	VI 34	at 18	VI 46	V1 00	\$1 De	£ .
	I dissipation	518.23 50.33 50.838	3	CII 1411   186.8	A) Did Re 8	\$0.000.163	Sp. en	2 7	Sunc	\$0.K.I	\$6 0H	\$0.14	3,083
C. 24         Crinity-in         Crinity-in-         Crinity-in- <td></td> <td>\$2.00 \$10.00 \$2.50 \$3.00</td> <td>50</td> <td>ζα (φ. Ιφ.)</td> <td>An capta 2 7</td> <td>Va trias 1 3</td> <td>, n os</td> <td>51 0.1</td> <td>EG B</td> <td>\$0.84</td> <td></td> <td>\$0.15</td> <td>2,354</td>		\$2.00 \$10.00 \$2.50 \$3.00	50	ζα (φ. Ιφ.)	An capta 2 7	Va trias 1 3	, n os	51 0.1	EG B	\$0.84		\$0.15	2,354
(1.70 CO DEDWED) (GEORGE) (GEO	The state of the s	81 61 8 2 8 9 8 8 3 8 9 8 8	#r y	Kn nu i snu	रत मन्त्र इत्तत	\$0.000.c.)	X X F J	K115	\$0 %	to as	E 5.	ć <u>e</u> ny	2,944
(1.1) Krimanati ka minasi ka ka Krima ka kina ka kina	4444	10 00X 80 00X 90 11X	ūλ (γ	Co (cortico) y	An unipurs	rt sam uš	15 U.S.		<b>CB</b> 75	\$0 au		\$0.15	77.0 c
		20 B S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	e: 13	Co Brinking	Ai freekii t	76 BOB432	X5 EV	* 13	<b>C</b> B 61	50 Rs	\$0.tHi	Fa (10	K ( P' )

Source. Company Financial reports and regulatory filings including tariffs, interconnection agreements and ARMIS reports. (CM extiniates

TERMINVLING	WHEN MINE THE CONTROL OF THE CONTROL	OBIGIACITAG AND TERMINATUG	Assumer DEM	8.4.11.0-11/2 (dinom vsq) 11:1-2-3m2222 2m2-migrio	194) TROTENARI (dinom (Almom	Zeenmochtl manth Messenmochtl Seenmochtl	1005 8711 (but		- (Sg80) S 4NI ( - NS 4 D ) V	\$4807 CO\$\$40	HIV
lunim MAC ramuerA	ratu ni en	estunim gritanigira	791 p mi en	yaşın üştü	sajnutul 	estunian guitunigiro					
Ç9 9 <u>8</u> §	86 763 STV FOT	<u> </u>	£ 1: 05	91 01 S IV	08 85 TOTHAS	50 013	58.51 <b>5</b> 1.18.51.13.91	tel L	100 \$	817	KBUZI
							14 - 15 16 - 5			į	
77.153			*_***	**4			TL 215			**************************************	0,630
26155	81.55		40 10		31.95	28.93	16 5\$ 98 51\$		<u> </u>	1 84.V	
							trais leats			- <u>1</u>	
<u> </u>	28.923	>8 4 <u>&gt;</u> 3	FF U\$	05.08	96.53	10.23	18 51 <b>5</b> 27 0 7 5	<u> </u>	. 585	87.A 1	#4
							(0 fc%			-	
08 855	21.11	481.5	81.03	81.07	18 95	<u> </u>	20 015	7.9	39111	- dvA	
							79.51 <b>5</b> 11.11 <b>5</b>			î Î	
							LC 158	<del> </del>	<del>\*\_</del>	1	810250
70.513	10363	19343	51.05	61 03	08 95		TR 717 18 82	54 L	181 5	I av	<b>21</b> /11 - 11
							87 115 11 115	•		ì	
16 bl.7	17 ELB	2 <u>6 F.L. 3</u>	<u></u>		31 <u>V13</u>	SP 013	36 143 [6 143	- :	tot	<u>8×y</u>	RARIE
ال ي ي ي ت			is on			in ate	01 1.5	v	<b>.</b>	\ <b>8</b> H	
							11745 06455			2	
08 017	28 A <u>2</u> 2	<u> </u>	11.03	18.62	08 87	63.82	15 £18 65 658	لانت	807	d v V	
AN 00°	* <b>a</b> v * *	1. 11.4	14 //4	14 214	no us		rl 715	. ,	WIFE	Ĭ.	
							05 298			3	
16553	<u>848 30</u>	<u> </u>	17.03	87 08	2111	1125	51 11 <b>5</b>	<u></u>		<u> </u>	asix» ld
							0.000			Ş	
<u>rius</u>	<u> </u>	36 9E\$	17 07	45.62	10.015	28 40	84 41 <b>3</b>	<del></del>		9 / V.	काल्प्रकरा स
							₹6 †₹5 ×. † [§			i I	
	<u> </u>	251.05	NE VI	36.93	<u> </u>		00 515			gy.A.	<b>508</b>
*****	21.114	71. 4 T B	07.07	_54 05	6.6 114		51: 215			1.	
			<u> </u>				15 95 <b>\$</b> 05 55 <b>\$</b>			l.	<u></u>
23.73	11.115	<u></u>	<u> </u>	1103	35013	413.53	10 41 <b>5</b> 60 12 <b>5</b>	<u></u>		gv.A	काल्सेक्स विशेष
							/8 #28 #5 815			<u>\$</u>	
69 663	12.065	>9 U <b>ć3</b>	20.32	11.05	<u> </u>	50.95	17113	4,9	1710	877.	
							18 115 17 115			usana asama	
00 573	<u></u>	<u>84 023</u>	<u>0. 05</u>	05.03	98.55	28 55	211 71		LEVI	8/7	notgaid
							16.95			Ī	
							97 518 >E 118			i	
							90 615 (E P45			>	
>2/13	TU (85	49 513	ZS 0S	95 05		12.85	16 61 <b>5</b>		745	784 Van	

Source. Company Funancial reports, and regulatory filings including tariffs, interconnection agreements and ARMIS reports. CCMI estimates

EUP.0044	06 175 0. 125 80 175	<b>v</b> . <b>t</b>	1765000\$	. 140400.03	0.0000.05	5		15.11	
- Lusia vi	10:5	<u></u>	1,0,00,03	120100 03	07000002	25.47			4-14
	219 28		•						
	tt ils								
*******	18.85	.2. OK	0.8100 05	N. I. W					
kiessanii	47.473		<u> </u>	018:00 02	.01100 05	61.07	<u> </u>	18.3	99 13
	19515								
	1115								
F 44.9	41.915	<u> خزید.</u>		20 00:00	6,5000 05	00.07	60.67		41.7
	26.015								
	10 m25 -8 5 15								
		- 1:1 .5	114100 05	117:00:02	50 00053	11.05	95.03	15.15	80 15
	PL 715						· <del></del>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
	t 11\$								
	16.55								
obesolo	98 5 ! S FZ 2 ( S	-17   7	0.3100.02	<u> </u>	02.0000.02	<u>                                  </u>	4:08	<u>۔۔۔۔ قاطلہ ۔۔۔۔۔</u>	<u></u>
	12 (13								
	16.55								
\$ doXi4	18 > }	84 >	008.00.05	968 (90.95	<u>6,00100 ii</u>	97, 65	i os	51.15	\$7.15 <u></u>
			INC VIN	84.1				1.18	S1V1018
						1141 zomnzez, gaitenigizo zotuaten	25 mazy A 25 mazy A 25 mazy A	(11-) sampez /, zatunim gaitknigero	Id somuses. estraim
FIVI	पुरात्त्र 1943 दिस्मी (क्षेत्रकाम	month (ber RVIE SORT	g nibanigina basa.L DBH DTI 772 (POTA 279)	ls to 1 Subsedimast DAIN FFW2 (FOC vop)	ATHER AND AND ANDRE (PO- 18042)	194) 4 f(J (կիրութո	उन्ते) <u>व</u> ास्	has gaidəti #2 1941() 1947-1947 (Hasm (Alusm	gnistori n.2 vodot) ugo trugonsvT (donom

RC (bet wouth) VelOBLIXED	194) 120)	որը կանում առ 15 2013 1 - 16 20 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	Dak gaidəli #2 1941() 1947 - Toqrası İ (Afasın	रभवे) वृ.] (1 (ब्राह्मकण	roq) 4 f() (dinam ()) ( comazes,	048 (4048 (404 (4048 (4044 (4048 (4044 (40	guiseaimasa Dalll ST\$#2 (TOB vsq)	gnibangine lesed DNIH DT1772 (2014 7979)	RATE	等()()()()()()()()()()()()()()()()()()()	4111
		MAG 20 mu22 L. rolunim	(111 samosz), zatunim gaitknigero	73 mm 77 / 17 / 17 / 18 / 18 / 18 / 18 / 18 /	क्षतां इस्ता प्रतास २०१४ ता छ						
91.0\$	00.03				77.37	1 100000	84.1	dat van			
					217 205	A 761130 m	Lu V		W1.1 .	16.55	# moxi
1102	00 02			CAL VA	<u></u>					FLILS	
	no or	11.15	11.15	17.05	15.08	or outled to	20.001.610	20 0015.0	_15 15	16.55	- obsaule
91.24	VV V									PZ 715 1 1 1 5	
9 . 115	00.08	80.15	15.15	¥: 0 <b>3</b>		526000 05	L14:00:01	1141000\$	د. د د	.8515 2005	
										16 015 10 115	
XI DX	00.03			00 03	00.03	6,6000 05	6.6:00.05	6,60100.03	<u>-21 15</u>	11 11 <b>5</b> 43 915	
										47 47 <b>5</b> 19 51 <b>5</b>	
20 00	00 9\$		18.3	<u>&gt; L U Ş</u>	61 05	.01100 05	V (00) VS	0.8100 05	<u> </u>	213.83	<u> </u>
								-		tt īls	
41 67	31.02	(.1)	11.13		- 1141	V10000 V1				In Its	E44)u
			15.71		65	to think is	Yes on the	1767pa n <b>4</b>	y	0. E2\$	# 18 P
										E   125	
70.05	20 00	77.72	12.3	01-05	<u> </u>	<u>20 080950</u>	280.00.05	P86100 87	4133	<u> </u>	Edest
										11858	
61.03	00 05	18 05	21.02	57.0 <b>5</b>	11 US	20,000.03	<u> 20 00.108</u>	801100 02	<u>- کب دلا ـ</u>	27.175	opirall w
										01 07\$ 57 7:2	
<u> </u>	20 00	25.13		98.05	61-112	action of the second of	11170001	211.00 02	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	क्ष्मत्रुद्धता मा
										16 FES	
91.03	90 15	<u>FF 13</u>	99.13	. 11.05	61.05	821100.05	<u> </u>	011100 01	<u>97.5.</u>	71.955	u 13 /
										00 50 <b>5</b> 56 8 1 <b>3</b>	
<u> </u>	00 05		1815	0005	<u> </u>	985100 05	£91100 05	20 003169	<u> </u>	12 455	Riodas dri
										10 7.8	
6Å ħ7	<u> </u>	41 18	92.15	9105	81 62	968000 07	000000 07	000000 82	1005	Lt ris	9
									€6 U\$	15:13	
	00 03	35.17	<u> </u>	01 1/3	6F 117	1:1100.03	<u> </u>	THE COM IS	70 .\$	1.615	an yaida
						2.11.00.05	44	asi "Lam ha	6	11.95	
										46:5	
81.02	0001			31.01	0001		121.00.42			90 615	
				e 1 116	44.416	erenna ne	55 W. DII OS	r (8100 05		166:\$	<b>2</b> u <sub>1</sub> wo 4
										1   U15 16 975	
	61 02 81 02 81 02 61 02 81 02 61 02 71 02 71 02 71 02	#1 n2	1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	Manage   M					10	10	10

## EXHIBITED A TENER OF DESCRIPTION OF THE STATE OF THE STAT

SIATE	RENSUL	AUCESN LANES (000s)	% of FOEVE ACCENS TENES	FOOP RAIL sper- month)	TOTAL SWITCHING AND TRANSPORT (per month)		AFI OTHER (per- manth)	AG OTHER (per month)	FULL 4 NEP ORIGINATING AND DERMINATING	FULLINEP ORIGINATING AND JERMINATING	May 2002 FULL UNEP ORIGINATING AND FERMINATING
					Assumes [4]]] originating minutes	Assumes DF M minutes	Assumes [41] originating minutes	Assumes DEM minutes	assumes 1444 originating minutes	Assumes DFM minutes	Assumes DEM minutes
D.C. Ameritreb	·			KEY INPUT		SUBTOTAL	.8			TOTALS	
Illinois	wid asy	1,216	1274	50 53	16.15	\$5.96	\$0.11	\$0.31	\$16.18	\$15 Xi	\$15.06
	metus		1, 1	\$3.59	, n ()	2	P11-1-1	20.11	\$10 °X	%( × )	112.10
	sabin ban			\$7.07							
	phal			\$1 i 40							
ndiana	wid avg	1396	40,	\$8.37	\$3.85	\$1.71	\$0.03	\$0.02	\$17.20	\$1 5 mg	\$16.87
	metro			\$R 0-3							
	Sugar ban			\$8.15							
Michigan	rura!	5,629	in.	\$10.16	\$1.50	\$1.09	\$0.10	60.25	\$15.96		\$14.50
	wid avg metro	7.619	[ tr->	\$8.47	\$1.89	2:00	Po to	\$0.25	×1 × 196	\$1150	314.50
	suburban			\$8.73							
	putal			\$12.54							
hio	wtd ave	4,106	7*.	\$7.01	\$7.80	17.11	\$0.64	\$0.59	\$15.45	\$ [ 1 9 1	514 96
	шеап			<b>\$</b> 5.01							
	samu han			<b>\$</b> 7.07							
Visconsin	(ura!			\$9.52							
	with a vg suburban	5.19.4	₫. <u>1</u> .,	\$10.90 \$10.90	511.27	\$10   1	\$ ' 9n	\$1 K2	\$25.07	\$ ? * N *	\$21.85
	paral			\$10.90							
1 C. Pacilic Bell					<del></del>						
alifornia	wid avg	18,617	l **.	59.91	\$6.77	\$5.43	\$0.0X	56.6%	\$16.78	\$15 an	517.47
	1			\$ N = 2 N							
	1			\$1 (.27)							
cyada	<del></del>	ίχζ		\$1961							
	wid avg	CKQ.	',	\$16.55	\$13.24	\$16.00	\$6.08	\$6.08	(11 83	\$10.63	\$30.54
	Salisti basi			\$1.77 \$77.61							
	p(18)			\$66.25							
II - Southwestern Bell											
rkentat	wid avy	1.0%	٠•,	<b>C</b> 1 00	\$5.75	\$ 5 ts	\$1.29	\$1.26	\$20.10	\$19.96	\$19 B1
	mbar,			SII Re							
	sumu baq mata			\$13.60							
ab121	wid ave	1251	7,1	\$1130							VI9 49
	nibat,	1 2 - 1	•	\$11.86	\$5.75	\$5.1%	\$1.30	\$1.75	8.0 Jz	\$19.60	119 49
	sulso bac			\$13.64							
	Dida:			\$23.44							
jaanri	wtd ave	3.751	ζ,	6.010	<b>4</b> 7.93	<b>C</b> 5.26	\$0.27	\$0.77	\$13.30	<b>(</b> 13.77	5261
	นเปลา.			\$12.70							
	suborban			\$18.64							
	tenn bflgq2-0M			\$19.74 \$16.11							
klahoma	wid avg	1.712	17,	\$15.71	\$8.45	\$8.63	\$1.37	\$1.10	\$25.50	\$24.03	V24 RR
	urban.	4. 4-	, ,	\$12.14	10 47	30.113	31 1/	31 117	5/2 21	3/2/114	3.74 88
	suburb a p			\$1266							
ctas	aua!			<u>\$2</u> 6.35							
etas	wid avg	10,118	1874	\$14.11	\$6.36	\$ - 48	\$1.24	\$1.14	<b>8</b> 21.71	\$21.55	\$21.16
	orhan			\$12.14							
	sahirban			\$13.65							
	ruja – i			\$18.98							

Source: Company Financial reports and regulatory filings including tariffs, interconnection agreements and ARMIS reports, CCMI estimates

Source: Company Funancial exports aret regulator filmgs including tariffs, interconnection agreements and ARMS reports. CCMB estimates

c09100 05

65 c = 00 03

0621000\$

eigling uş

08:100.05

615100.05

908000005

C. 5000 05

990000 9<u>5</u>

<u>(05.100.03</u>

65 C.00 US

61 Junios

UNT 100 05

0.9.00 01

RUBELON OF

611100.05

9,8000.05

CS000-0\$

11.08

11:41

ti us

LE IIS

20.03

10.05

80.05

961

51177

9817

987

tis.

460

6981

17075

1971

COMMERCE CAPITAL MARKETS, INC

00.05

00.05

90.05

quar.

on 95

00.03

00.03

00.05

90.05

95.0\$

61.03

PF 0%

No 81%

9h 05

85.05

24.05

56.05

estunins

STVTOTERS

19.05

91.05

45 65

1918

51.15

71.05

£8.03

71. 15

00.05

In U.

20.15

00.03

00.03

10.03

50.05

क्ष्या स्टब्स

avan samusiy (4)40 iu rog) tragenril 1941 Modenti

estumo gnitenigico sojnuțiu 111175180357 1V3 (I geening or ( q) u o m (d) an m

gaitenigito LIBE SHIPSS (4) u o m

90 15

90.15

90.15

90 I\$

00 05

00.05

t E 015

(0.0**\$** 

Ct 05

667000 US

681000 0S

988000 08

941000-05

801500 05

rrequire us

erciou ny

008000 01

855000.03

.9000 05

a coulde by

THOR isd) 4.46

8.6

(FOR ead)

RATE (per RATE (per SMILCHING SMILCHING (per 1RANSPORT (per

GOOM

SLOAST CAN

(संस्कृत्य

POST Lineal originating Local terminating STITCHING AND

THE TELL BUILDING THE OWNER FROM COMMISSION AND SOME SECTIONS - SHC

10.5%

Opeou

HIVIS

Mastitam A 11

14115 Pluit

50 928 54 615 

12415 te bls 49.813 LOCAL.

TELES 14115 98 175

01:13

PE LOS 19 E.S. 98.115

60 (15

19.05 41 115

14 h15 41.115 NI XS

16.63

06.015 060.5

25.65 10.68 16.55

1075

\$5.735 LL XX Z# 8%

9:018

66.85 51.85 £0.83

£ 85

UP 115

7.016% 0.515

1 5 10 8

19.15

88.05

1879

amodei#O

HROSHIM

sesue M

shevs/

gin tolile Host office Well

nizaoozi M

940

esgidai1A

ensibal.

Nobelten edition

TAIDBU STUTBUT DULD STURING THEM STATES ON WHEN SEVENIES AND REZON

STATE	DENNITY	ACCENN LINES (BBB)	Settory VCESS UNN	COOPRAIF	TOTAL SWITCHING AND TOOP RALE TRANSPORT (per oper month)	NATICELLAND RANSPURI (per ALL OTHER (per woorth)	ALL O HIPK (per month)	ALL OTHER (per month)	ELLI I NEF ORIGINALING 13 RMINALING	PELETANE ORIGINATING AND LERMINATING	MAY 2002 FULL I NEP ORIGENATING AND LERMINATING
			•	:	frequmes † 51 F originating minudes	Assumes DEAL minuster	Assumes 1-411 redginasing minutes	Assumes OP M minutes	Vesumee 1415 originating minutes	Assumes DEM monutes	Vecumer DEM
LUC NAMEN				KEY INPUT		SABIOLALS	11.5			101415	
Maine		7 Kil	;	\$15.18 \$11.14 \$13.17	*. *2	(4.3)	\$0.05 (40.1%)	\$0 T	\$33.61	K27.83	\$22.1R
Maxischusetti	۸۷ <u>و</u> ۱ ۲	7 20 7	10.	\$11.98 \$2.54 \$14.11 \$16.12 \$20.04	[6][5]	\$10.36	61.03	\$0.18	\$.8 DR	E P Y S	\$25.37
New York	Avg - n n	×	ć.	\$18.10 \$11.47 \$16.04 \$25.00	50.21	\$6.03	\$t u\$	\$0.18	<b>(</b> 54.77	15173	11 673
Rhada Island	g	15.721	" <u>- 1</u> - 1	51: 18 51: 10 51: 11 51: 51:	Kb 41	36 50	\$0.0k	\$0.08	K1.7 dR	\$1713	\$17.36
	*	 	Í	413.91 412.19 515.11	45 d.	45.11	: 0 03	£6.63	2.00.3	N. 6.78	20 003
LEC BELLATIANTIC	37 7. 17	os.	٠,٠	XI 87 C 77 XI 88 XI 88	7 TO	F> 0   \$	\$0.03	\$0.01	11.7	\$21.00	\$25.09
Delaware Delaware Marsiad		710.		\$10 K; \$10 a5 \$10 a7 \$13 13	3.5 p.y	\$6.02	\$0.00	\$0.00	SF 0.3	16.83	\$16.83 \$20.31
7	a	2 Fr #	į	41:50 41:30 51:85 525 46 518 10	<b>\$</b> 1:1 <sup>5</sup>	<b>(</b> 5) <0	\$0.3 e	\$6.55 \$1.55	:04.5	), y, y;	8. p. y
Penns Ivasi	a	010 :	. e	58 83 68 83 61 64 510 43	(7.43	\$	\$0.10	\$0.07	417 14	415 14	\$15.13
Verine	g - c: r q	7,304	الهرم	\$13 K; \$10 25 \$13 60 \$14 60 \$16 75	פֿרָ אַץ	\$.	\$0.20	£1 0 <b>5</b>	\$ 0.5 v	\$ [ <del>4</del> ] \$	91 o 1 s
West Virginia	A + 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4	1,460	١ (١٠ م	\$13.76 \$16.45 \$29.40	45 65	52.52	<b>\$0</b> \$4		S. I. R.	\$118	\$23.68
Comments	- 11 m			\$14.40 \$12.04 \$43.44	V.00 K.3	78 65. <b>x</b>	=======================================	\$0.13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\$110	(41a)

Source Company Financial reports and regulatory flugs including tariffs, interconnection agreements and ARMIS reports, CCMI estimates

ייישטייי שניייין

M30 AATOT 199 (204) (29) (4)num	(bec wortp) VAIOR (IXED ARC	the CLI KE COZE		Other Switching and Transport (per month)	eads A.3 C	(94) 3 10 (4) august	OTHER SMITCHING AND TRANSFORT (per MOUS		Surfangrio bese [ ON TECHNO (JOIC 1945	PORT (per month)	COOP RAFF	नार
1			PEG somure? salumm RIATOTA	18. 1. 18. 19. 19. 19. 19. 19. 19. 19. 19. 19. 19	t (d romas) roman	l le les masses gainsantgree estaum		S1	HEV TABLE	,		
I £ ¥ L	F1 U\$	0g 0 <b>š</b>	£9.1 <b>\$</b>	91.3	10.08	£0.03	nds ten os	085100 64	198.41 OB 41#	\$6.0\$	81915	NANAN (
											54.81\$ 41.48\$ 54.41\$	<del></del>
058,1	<u>\$1.0\$</u>	no v <b>š</b>	54.1 <b>\$</b>	<u></u>	£0 05 <u></u>	<u> 10 04 </u>	015100 U\$	atskou u <b>s</b>	\$42400 O <b>\$</b>	00 <b>, \$</b>	87 54 87 54 11 418 11 418	<b>រៀ</b> ១១ភូមិន
700.0	10.08	00.05	80.0\$	υξ (\$	<u> 5₹ 0≸</u>	£F.0\$	\$0.00 <b>08</b> 53	\$90700 U\$	100,000 03	12.03	10.01\$ 46.14\$ 01.81\$	ondequish
016.1	80 P\$	£ , 17 <b>\$</b>	£a 0 <b>≵</b>	28.0\$	00.05	B0*(6 <b>\$</b>	825000 0\$	111100 0\$	£11100 0\$	45 53	15 11\$ 04 4\$ 6F U\$	Ainl
000 0	90 0	ξε μ <b>1</b>	80 H3	97 I <b>\$</b>	10.0\$	£0.0 <b>5</b>	£5¥0000 U\$	261 [00 0 <b>\$</b>	85 F100 O4	98.13	61 +13 16 +13 15 +13	lins[r] ob
600] c	90 03	-10 ti <b>3</b>	11-15	16.13	10.03	\$0.0 <b>\$</b>	852100.08	100F00 a\$	1001000\$	10 13	11:115	}400
						<u> </u>				<del></del> -	24 47\$ 58 8\$ 54 45	- 311XV11V 1138 -
11t l	95 05	90 0 <b>\$</b>	25 0 <b>\$</b>	80 0 <b>\$</b>	01 0 <b>\$</b>	80 0 <b>\$</b>	90-9000 0 <b>\$</b>	2 co 100 0\$ 000 (00 05	\$59500 0\$	55 1 <b>5</b>	50 21% 18 01%	318 6
-											24415 11115 20015	
850°č	20 H	4F1 <b>\$</b>	i tr U\$	ts 0 <b>5</b>	£0.0 <b>\$</b>	ξο ο <b>1</b>	्ष्यस्थामा ११%	1911 <b>8 - 1</b> 013 11 <b>%</b>	<u> </u>	<u>0</u> 6 11	96 5 7 5 96 5 7 5 98 2 1 5 11 2 1 5 10 5 6 1 5	psierja
15£1	00 0 <b>\$</b>	00 05	41.0\$	17.05	£0.0%	0) 0\$	£41000.0\$	¥65206.8 <b>\$</b>	\$44,000 D\$	11.05	05 08 21 8\$ 25 0\$	Joseph
002 1	11.01	00.0\$	S c 0\$	ti U\$	£0 0\$	£0.65	CECUOU US	s intog a <b>s</b>	cu <b>s</b> (100 05	<u>no 15</u>	00 113 50 013 18 515 56 015	RIME OF CO.
<u> </u>	91 05	00.0\$	Z 1 U <b>\$</b>	£00 <b>\$</b>	£0 0 <b>\$</b>	10 00	\$91000.0\$	<u>640300 U\$</u>	<u>0.01100 0\$</u>	<u>0x 15</u>	96 11\$ 56 41\$ 00 11\$	riu;
									0.00		01 67\$ 51 91\$ 11 01\$	sini3 ii 7
12.2	00.0\$	00.03	U£ 0 <b>\$</b>	97.08		_ £1 0 <b>\$</b>	ลีรัสถดต ดิสั	559500 0 <b>5</b>	8488IIII 9 <u>8</u>	_09.1\$	FU 32\$ 6# F1\$ 	or a sekingen

Source. Company Financial reports arid regulatory filings in hiding tariffs, micreonnection agreements and ARMIS reports, CCMI estimates.

## RESEARCH DIRECTORY



William Sutherland. Director of Research	(215) 282-4019
Michael Viola	(215) 282-3874
Retail: Specialty & Electronics	
Richard A. Zimmerman	(215) 282-4017
Ryan S. Zeichner	(215) 282-8016
Specialty Chemicals & Materials	
Christopher M. Crooks, CFA	(215) 282-4018
Dawn G. Moehn	(215) 282-4014
Telecommunications & Broadband Services	
Anna Maria Kovacs, Ph.D., CFA	(617) 576-5764
Kristin L. Burns. Ph.D.	(617) 576-5764
Gregory S. Vitale	(617) 576-5764
Telecommunications Equipment, Connectware &	& Network Security
William R. Becklean, CFA	(617) 576-5850
Michael Kern	(617) 576-5848
Guoila Zhang	(215) 282-8020
Administration	
Elizabeth-Anne DeStefano	(215) 282-3877
Institutional Sales & Trading	
	(866) 519 6400

## Goldman Sachs

# SBC Communications, Inc. (SBC) Meeting with SBC CFO highlights key initiatives; no estimate or ratings change.

11:05 AM – August 22, 2002		
Mark	et Outperformer	
Large	–Cap Value	
Price:	US\$28.11	

Stock data		Price performance	1M	3M 12M
52-week range	US\$47.34-23.30	Absolute	5% -1	9% -35%
Yield	3.8%	Rel to S&P 500	-7% -	7% -17%
Capitalization		Forecasts/valuation	2002E	2003E
Market cap	US\$93.5bn	EPS*	US\$2.30	US\$2.30
Latest net debt/(cash)	_	GSCOPE EPS*	-	
Free float	-	GSCOPE P/E	-	_
Shares outstanding	3325mn	* May differ from US GAAP	_	

SBC considers fixing the UNE-P mess, as a prime corporate objective. Delayed LD entry in key locations, combined with the lowest UNE-P rates in the country, have uniquely exposed SBC to profit-eroding share loss. Despite this, SBC's CFO Randall Stephenson still sees stable cash flows through aggressive cost cutting, combined with the ability to maintain trends in share repurchases and dividend hikes. Consolidation in wireless is another key objective of SBC. Acknowledging the proliferation of conversations among wireless carriers, Stephenson indicated all talks are still preliminary. In the meantime Cingular is raising prices, sacrificing sub growth, and looking to improve profits.

#### **Full details**

WHAT TO DO WITH THE STOCK? We continue our cautious view of telecom, although recent stock price declines make us somewhat less cautious.

Within the group the Bells and rural telcos should provide the best returns. And, within the Bells, we continue to view Verizon as the best choice right now. As management indicates, share loss to UNE-P is going to be quite damaging to SBC. And we believe it will suffer the greatest consequences of this phenomenon among the three Bells. Thus, the valuation premium that SBC trades at relative to Verizon on P/E, EV/EBITDA, and dividend yield is probably not sustainable over the next six months. We continue to use our current EPS estimates of \$2.30 for this year and next.

UNE-P A BIG PROBLEM WITHOUT LD. SBC has been the most vocal critic of UNE-P, and is working hard to raise prices and diminish the negative effect. In the absence of pervasive long distance approval, UNE – P has been and will continue to be very damaging to SBC. With LD approval in the Ameritech region not likely until the middle or second half of '03, and California not likely until yearend '02, SBC stands quite exposed at the moment. However, we should not extrapolate the SBC experience uniformly to the other RBOCs. No others face the unique combination of low priced UNE- P. high residential rates (in the Ameritech region), big concentrated industrial states, and no  ${\sf LD}$ capability. Thus, we don't see Verizon in particular, and BellSouth to a lesser degree has having the same degree of exposure. So, yes, if an ILEC loses a customer to UNE-P it's a big hit to the bottom line – but it has to lose the customer for the hit to be taken. And in our view VZ and BLS are likely to be able to offset this materially better than SBC over the next year. It should be noted that SBC has been enjoying these same benefits share retention in its states where it has long distance approval. SBC intends to file cost studies in key jurisdictions, using the regulatory path as one attempt at raising rates. In addition, it continues to try to use bundling as aggressively as possible to offset share

WIRELESS CONSOLIDATION A KEY OBJECTIVE. Newspaper reports have

Frank J. Governali, CFA frank.governali@gs.com Portland: 1–207–772–3300

Jason Armstrong, CFA jason.armstrong@gs.com Portland: 1-207-772-3391

Goldman Sachs Global Equity Research FOR IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT GOLDMAN SACHS' RATING SYSTEM AND OTHER DISCLOSURES, REFER TO THE END OF THIS MATERIAL, GO TO http://www.gs.com/research/hedge.html, OR CONTACT YOUR INVESTMENT REPRESENTATIVE.

exaggerated the speed of wireless consolidation and the progress that has been made to date. However, the desirability of getting a deal done is obvious, and the company acknowledged active conversations. Mr. Stephenson noted that of the two options for deals AWE presents less dilution but greater regulatory and integration hurdles. Voicestream presents higher dilution but far easier regulatory approval and integration. Furthermore, similar to press accounts, he indicated a deal for Voicestream may be impractical without taking in DT as an equity participant (i.e. no all—cash deal.) And, importantly, SBC is open to that possibility.

WIRELESS PRICE HIKES. DESPITE SLOWER SUB GROWTH. The healing effects of wireless mergers are not nearly upon us yet. In the meantime. Cingular is taking steps to 'heal thyself.' The price hikes are geared to boost profitability, even as it sacrifices sub growth. The particular increase in national plan rates announced this week are geared to both reduce off—network roaming costs and slow down the consumption of TDMA network capacity. SBC and BLS are fully expecting their joint venture to experience low to no sub growth as a result of these actions as well as the customer churn that will be stimulated by the WorldCom reseller shift.

CAPEX TO REVENUE SHOULD BE NO HIGHER THAN 15%. AND WILL BE LOWER ABSENT GROWTH. There is a broad effort to cut capex in both wireline and wireless operations. In wireline, Stephenson indicated that current thinking is that capex to sales should be no higher than 15%, and that in the current environment it should be no higher than 13%, and yet it is. Thus, further capex cuts should occur. In our view, if demand recovery continues to falter it would not be surprising to see capex to sales fall below the 13% rate, as it has in other countries. On the wireless side, capex cuts are also anticipated. In our view, slower capex spending in wireless is further supported by the prospects of industry consolidation.

COST REDUCTIONS KEY TO MAINTAINING EARNINGS AND BOOSTING MARGINS. SBC sees the margin differential between it and VZ and BLS as indicating an opportunity for further cost cutting. Pointing to opportunities in consolidating call centers, raising efficiencies in network operations, and generally trimming overhead costs, Stephenson is focused and confident in using these steps to help improve margins in the face of share loss.

CALIFORNIA DSL EXPERIENCE GIVES CONFIDENCE IN LONG TERM POTENTIAL. In California, SBC is enjoying the benefits of scale DSL operations, having achieved about 10% penetration so far. As a result, operations are already EBITDA positive and on the trajectory to reach SBC's targeted hurdle rate.

The steps that got California to scale include: an effective self—installation program: low help desk costs: effective churn control (down towards 2-3%); and effective marketing against the cable operators. SBC believes that mass market deployment of DSL will occur, and that tiered offerings are one step in getting there. This will allow lower monthly prices for lower speeds, but should be able to maintain an average monthly price of approximately \$40. This is a little higher than our long term estimate, but directionally our models look at the market in the same way. Due to the absence of long distance approval in California and the Ameritech states. SBC will continue to try to bundle DSL as a way of offsetting share loss, indicating that churn falls 75% for those customers taking DSL on top of their local service

#### BIS-US\$ 25.99. SBC-US\$ 28.11, VZ: US\$ 32.35

The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. and/or its affiliates make a market or are the specialist in the following companies' securities: BellSouth Corp., and Verizon Communications. As such, the market maker or specialist may have an inventory position, either "long" or "short," in the relevant security and may be on the opposite side of orders executed on the relevant exchange.

The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. and/or its affiliates have received during the past 12 months compensation for investment banking services from the following companies, their parents, or their wholly owned or majority-owned subsidiaries: BellSouth Corp., SBC Communications, Inc., and Verizon Communications.

The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. and/or its affiliates expect to receive or intend to seek compensation for investment banking services in the next 3 months from these companies, their parents, or wholly owned or majority-owned subsidiaries: BellSouth Corp., SBC Communications, Inc., and Verizon Communications.

#### (C) 2002 The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. All rights reserved

The Goidman Sachs Group, inclusia full-service, integrated investment banking, investment management, and brokerage firm. We are a leading underwriter of securities and a leading participant in virtually all trading markets. We have investment banking and other business relationships with a substantial percentage of the companies covered by our investment Research Department. Our research professionals provide important input into our investment banking and other business selection processes. Investors should assume that The Goidman Sachs Group, Inc. and/or its affiliates are seeking or will seek investment banking or other business from the company or companies that are the subject of this material and that the research professionals who were involved in preparing this material may participate in the solicitation of such business. Our research professionals are paid in part based on the profitability of The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc., which includes earnings from the firm's investment banking and other business. The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc., generally prohibits its analysts, persons reporting to analysts, and members of their households from maintaining a financial interest in the securities or futures of any companies that the analysts cover. Additionally, The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. generally prohibits its analysts, persons reporting to analysts, or members of their households from serving as an officer, director, or advisory board member of any companies that the analysts cover. Our salespeople, traders, and other professionals may provide oral or written market commentary or trading strategies to our clients that reflect opinions that are contrary to the opinions expressed herein, and our proprietary trading and investing businesses may make investment decisions that are inconsistent with the recommendations expressed herein, in reviewing these materials, you should be aware that any or all of the foregoing, among other things, may give rise to real or potential conflicts of interest. Additionally, other

This material should not be construed as an offer to seli or the solicitation of an offer to buy any security in any jurisdiction where such an offer or solicitation would be illegal. We are not soliciting any action based on this material, it is for the general information of clients of The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. It does not take into account the particular investment objectives, if nancial istuations, or needs of individual clients. Before acting on any advice or recommendation in this material, clients should consider whether it is suitable for their particular circumstances and, if necessary, seek professional advice. Certain transactions – including those involving futures, options, and other derivatives as well as non-investment-grade securities – give rise to substantial risk and are not suitable for all investors. The material is based on information that we consider reliable, but we do not represent that it is accurate or complete, and it should not be relied on as such. Opinions expressed are our current opinions as of the date appearing on this material only. We endeave to update on a reasonable basis the information discussed in this material, but regulatory, compliance, or other reasons may prevent us from doing so. We and our affiliates, officers, directors, and employees, including options in not insurance of this material, may from time to time have "long" or "short" positions in, act as principal in, and buy or sell the securities or derivatives (including options) thereof of companies mentioned herein. No part of this material may be (i) copied, photocopied, or duplicated in any form by any means or (ii) redistributed without The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc.'s prior written consent.

In smaterial has been issued by The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. and/or one of its affiliates and has been approved by Goldman Sachs International, which is regulated by The Financial Services Authority in connection with its distribution in the United Kingdom and by Goldman Sachs Canada in connection with its distribution in Canada. This material is distributed in the United States by Goldman, Sachs & Co., in Hong Kong by Goldman Sachs (Asia) LLC., in Korea by Goldman Sachs (Asia) LLC., Seoul Branch, in Japan by Goldman Sachs (Asia) LLC., and in Singapore by Goldman Sachs (Asia) LLC., Seoul Branch, in Japan by Goldman Sachs (Asia) LLC., and in Singapore by Goldman Sachs (Singapore) Pte. This material is not for distribution in the United Kingdom to private customers, as that term is defined under the rules of The Financial Services Authority, any investments, including any convertible bonds or derivatives, mentioned in this material will not be made available by us to any such private customer. Goldman Sachs International and its non-US affiliates may, to the extent permitted under applicable law, have acted on or used this research, to the extent that it relates to non-US issuers, prior to or immediately following its publication. Foreign-currency-denominated securities are subject to fluctuations in exchange rates that could have an adverse effect on the value or price of, or income derived from, the rivestment in addition, investors in securities such as ADRs, the values of which are influenced by foreign currencies, effectively assume currency risk in addition, options involve risk and are not suitable for all investors. Please ensure that you have read and understood the current options disclosure document before entering into any options transactions.

Further information on any of the securities mentioned in this material may be obtained on request, and for this purpose, persons in Italy should contact Goldman Sachs S.I.M.
5.p.A. in Milan or its London branch office at 133 Fleet Street; persons in Hong Kong should contact Goldman Sachs (Asia) L.L.C. at 2 Queen's Road Central; and persons in Australia should contact Goldman Sachs Australia Pty Limited. Unless governing law permits otherwise, you must contact a Goldman Sachs entity in your home jurisdiction if you want to use our services in effecting a transaction in the securities mentioned in this material

Analyst coverage and other disclosure information is available at http://www.gs.com/research/hedge.html

09:22am EDT 22-Aug-02 Legg Mason (Levin, Blair(202)778-1595) Q T VZ BLS SBC Q.N Bells Retrain Guns on UNE-P, but Quick Kill Unlikely part 1

Legg Mason Wood Walker, Inc.

Industry Update August 22, 2002

Blair Levin blevin@leggmason.com (202) 778-1595 Daniel Zito dezito@leggmason.com (410) 454-4333

Bells Retrain Guns on UNE-P, but Quick Kill Unlikely

All relevant disclosures appear on the last page of this report.

#### KEY POINTS:

- \* We believe the debate at the FCC over the future of UNE-P has surpassed the broadband debate in intensity and near-term importance for the telecom sector, as the Bells have been thrown on the defensive due to line losses to rivals.
- We believe that the Bells (SBC, BLS, VZ, Q) will have a difficult time convincing regulators to quickly eliminate the rights of local competitors to lease out Bell networks (UNE-P) at deep discounts. This is problematic for all the Bells but, in our view, is particularly problematic for SBC as its lack of long-distance progress in the Ameritech region makes it more vulnerable to UNE-P competitors. The Bells could gain some immediate relief in business markets (as well as some relief toward deregulating their broadband offerings in separate proceedings), but we doubt the FCC will eliminate UNE-P in residential markets in the near term.
- We believe the Commission is likely to establish a sunset or triggers for phasing out UNE-P. While the details of such rules are far from settled, we think the result will give key UNE-P providers, WorldCom (WCOEQ) and AT&T (T), time to continue to change the facts on the ground. The more they win new local customers, the more they increase the potential for a backlash if the phase-out dismantles the main platform for residential competition.
   Even if the FCC scraps or pares back UNE-P, many state regulators would likely try to retain it. Also, all decisions would be subject to court challenge that could take years to resolve, with the courts likely to
- maintain the legal status quo in the meantime.

  \* While the Bells will not gain immediate regulatory relief, we believe that through bundling and other marketing efforts, they can significantly reduce
- the negative impact of UNE-P competition.

  \* We believe another potential nightmare for the Bells would be if cable begins using UNE-P to accelerate its budding cable telephony offerings.

As we noted when WorldCom announced its "Neighborhood" plan, the intensified efforts by WorldCom (WCOEQ) and AT&T (T) to compete using the Bell Unbundled Network Elements Platform (UNE-P) has dramatically raised the stakes of the FCC unbundling policy debates. (See our April 23 note WCOM/MCI Bundled Phone Offer Challenges Rivals and Regulators.) The most recent Bell quarterly reports suggest that the impact of UNE-P is quickly growing. (For a discussion of the economics of UNE-P, see the report by our colleagues Daniel Zito and Brad Wilson, Cautious Long-Distance Outlook, June 27, 2002. For a state-by-state UNE pricing and sensitivity study, see attachment to VZ: Comments on RBOC Weakness, August 21, 2002, by our collegues Michael J. Balhoff and Christopher. C. King.)
The impact of UNE-P has caused the Regional Bell Operating Companies (SBC, BLS, Q, VZ) to shift their priorities in seeking regulatory relief.

While the core Bell policy thrust had been to gain deregulation of their broadband services, recent events suggest the Bells have ramped up their lobbying efforts to cripple the ability of competitors to use UNE-P to gain market share in the traditional voice market.

Some in the Bell camp have predicted the FCC will act to eliminate UNE-P in a flash cut. FCC action on UNE-P is still months away (probably 4-8 months) but our current view is that prediction is likely to prove largely inaccurate in the near term, particularly concerning the availability of UNE-P in residential markets. This note outlines some of the dynamics affecting the resolution of the UNE-P debate.

Background on UNE-P. UNE-P offers competitors an opportunity to use all the UNEs at discounted "TELRIC" (Total Element Long Run Incremental Cost) rates and to add further value-added services on top of the platform. According to an industry estimate building on a FCC survey of incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs), of the 20-plus million lines won by long-distance companies (IXCs) and other local competitors (CLECs) as of June 2002, about 7.7 million are UNE-P based. It is the fastest growing method of competitive entry. In 2001, according to FCC data, more than 60% of the CLEC line growth was due to UNE-P, about twice the rate in 2000. T and WCOEQ are capturing most of the UNE-P line growth but other companies are responsible for about 43% of UNE-P lines.

Reasons for Increase in UNE-P Competition. While UNE-P has been available for some time, its use has ramped up significantly over the last year. In our view, this is due to two critical developments. First, numerous states have lowered wholesale UNE-P rates. Second, the Bells have achieved sufficient long-distance entry to give the IXCs the incentive to more aggressively use UNE-P to protect their existing markets.

Differing Impact on the Bells. UNE-P has had a differing impact on each of the Bells, affecting SBC and BLS more negatively in the last quarter than VZ. The reason for this difference, in our view, is that VZ's relative lead in gaining long-distance entry (with 74% of its lines already eligible) has given it the ability to bundle local and long distance in more states, providing a stronger defense against competition. As a measure of the value of long distance offerings in combating UNE-P competition, we note that SBC estimates that where it offers long distance, it doubles its winback rates. We also think that VZ's intensified strategy of bundling their landline voice services with wireless and Internet access services will provide an even stronger defense against UNE-P competitors.

We surmise that BLS will have greater success in stemming the tide of UNE-P line loss once it gains the right to offer long distance services in more states. It currently has applications pending in 5 of the remaining 7 states where it cannot offer such services. An FCC decision on these 5 is due in mid-September and we believe the prospects for approval are good. In light of UNE-P competition, SBC's problems in advancing its Sec. 271 long-distance applications become more important to SBC's financial picture. This is particularly true in the Ameritech region and California. SBC has a large window of vulnerability in the Ameritech region where state regulators have been aggressive in providing incentives for UNE-P competition, but SBC has not made significant progress with the testing and verification required for Sec. 271 approval. In California, SBC has better prospects, as it hopes to send the FCC its long-distance application in September. Given the TELRIC price cuts just announced by the state PUC and California's size, we expect a major push by T to sign up customers before SBC gets approval to offer long distance services.

Q has some vulnerability to UNE-P, due to its lack of long-distance approval, but we expect Q to gain approval to offer long distance services in a number of states in the next several months. While Q's states are not the highest priority states for the UNE-P based competitors, we note that UNE-P competition has attracted more than 5% market share in Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

The Bells' Attack on UNE-P. The Bells have two basic strategies for attacking the viability of UNE-P. First, they can challenge the TELRIC discounts at both the federal and state levels in an effort to raise UNE-P rates and squeeze their competitors' margins. Verizon recently took this tact at the FCC through a letter by its General Counsel suggesting ways the agency could "clarify" TELRIC, all in ways that would have the affect of raising the price for competitors. We expect the other Bell companies to join this effort. The Bells are also likely to challenge individual state UNE pricing decisions in regulatory proceedings and in court. For example, SBC has already filed a petition to raise TELRIC rates in OH and we have heard they are considering filing a petition to do the same in Illinois, though they are waiting until after the November election, in which three of the five members of the State PUC could change. The Bells are also contemplating filing suits challenging some of the states' TELRIC decisions as an unconstitutional taking.

Second, as part of the FCC's "Triennial Review" proceding, the Bells hope to convince the FCC to remove certain elements, most notably switching, from the UNE list. Such a decision would not only raise the cost of providing services through UNE-P, it also would make UNE-P impractical for the consumer market due to the difficulty of seamlessly migrating tens of thousands of lines from the ILEC's to the competitor's switches. We note that as offering unbundled switching is specifically listed as one of the requirements for gaining long-distance entry, the legal burden of eliminating the requirement is likely to be higher.

While the Republican majority at the Commission wants to move in a deregulatory direction, we do not believe that majority has yet decided how that impulse should be channeled in revising the UNE rules. The staff is evaluating the effects of UNEs in various markets, and that analysis, particularly regarding the impact of UNE-P on investment in facilities, could swing any of the commissioners in different directions. (The review is at an early stage as the staff is currently immersed in evaluating 17 pending Sec. 271 applications.) But some of the dynamics affecting the UNE-P policy process are already apparent.

FCC Direction: Set Out Path for Gradual Elimination of UNE-P. We believe that the FCC is likely to view UNE-P as a transitional vehicle to more facilities-based competition. We also believe that the Commission views the D.C. Circuit's May 24 USTA v. FCC ruling on UNEs favoring the ILECs, as subjecting any decision to eliminate an element on a national basis to a material legal risk. In that light, we believe the Commission is likely to view its job in the Triennial Review not as deciding whether to keep or eliminate UNE-P, but rather to set forth the right balance of incentives and market signals for creating a glide path from UNE-P to facilities-based competition.

Transitional Tools: Sunsets and Triggers. There are two basic ways the Commission could act. First, it can eliminate UNE-P at a date certain (a "sunset"). While that approach provides the most market certainty, it is legally vulnerable. Critics could attack an FCC projection of future market conditions as not reflecting the requirement that competitors' should be able to gain access to network elements without which their ability to compete would be "impaired." One way to mitigate the legal risk is to provide a "soft" sunset in which the date merely creates a presumption that the FCC would act to eliminate UNE-P. While such a rule is more defensible, it provides less certainty to the market and the companies, effectively delaying the ultimate debate for another day; a day, it is worth noting, in which the composition of the Commission and the market structure of the telecom industry could be very different.

(continued...)
First Call Corporation, a Thomson Financial company.
All rights reserved. 888.558.2500

09:23am EDT 22-Aug-02 Legg Mason (Levin, Blair(202)778-1595) Q T VZ BLS SBC Q.N Bells Retrain Guns on UNE-P, but Quick Kill Unlikely part 2

The second method is to provide "triggers" by which the Commission would measure whether access to switching, or the UNE-P platform, is no longer needed. These could include competitive metrics, such as a market share loss, or technical prerequisites to a healthy unregulated wholesale market, such as electronic loop provisioning. Triggers would be stronger legally but would retain market uncertainty about the long-term prospects of UNE-P. Further, there is a question as to whether the federal or state regulators would have the task of doing the fact finding on the triggers, a decision that could further impact the timing of when and whether the trigger is actually pulled. Another way of transitioning away from UNE-P is to continue to require the Bells to provide access to the platform but to no longer require TELRIC pricing. Rather, the price could be set by the states as a tariff that would have to be "just and reasonable." While this would probably increase the cost to competitors, it would likely involve lengthy litigation and regulatory delay.

We believe the debate over UNE-P will ultimately move to a debate about this transition. In such a debate, just like the legislative and regulatory debate over the 14-point checklist for Bell long-distance entry, details are critical. Also, just as with the legislative and subsequent regulatory fights over Section 271, the significance of the details is both a market structure issue (that is, how will the market look when the transition is over) and a timing issue (that is, how long will it take for the sunset to occur or the trigger to take affect.) The Bells will be arguing for fast, certain and limited transitional elements; their opponents will argue for the opposite. The critical point, from our perspective, is that adoption of sunsets or triggers will not end the debate; rather, just as with Section 271, it changes the debate but inevitably leads to a longer time period before a material change in the current status. Eliminating UNE-P Quickly: The Bells have some hope. The Bells still have some hope of either eliminating or quickly transitioning away from UNE-P. This is particularly true regarding switching for business offerings. First, we note that the analysis for using UNE-P to serve business and residential customers is different. We believe the FCC is more sympathetic to the Bell's case for paring back unbundled switching in business markets, as competitors have installed numerous switches to serve such customers. Such installations call into question whether new entrants' ability to compete in business markets would be impaired without unbundled switching. We think the FCC generally wants to cut back on the use of UNE-P for business customers. It could rule, for example, that the current exemption of unbundled switching for customers with four or more lines should apply in all markets, and not just the top 50. An alternative approach would be to have a trade-off between the number of lines and the market size, such as an exemption for the smaller markets (i.e., markets 50 thfough 100) where the line count was greater (i.e., 12 lines or higher.) A key political issue here is whether small business advocacy groups, which generally do not engage in telecom policy debates, will fight any further restrictions on the use of UNE-P.

Regarding UNE-P generally, FCC Chairman Michael Powell and other key policymakers have expressed a preference for facilities-based competition. Some officials believe that UNE-P does not really provide sustainable, new benefits to consumers and therefore should eventually be eliminated. The Bells will use their depressed stock prices and earnings to argue that the economics of UNE-P will cripple the last remaining strong players in the telecom sector, ILECs, and thereby threaten network investment and reliability. Market trends toward the end of the decision-making process could affect the details of the transition that the FCC ultimately chooses. The Bells will also benefit from the reduced political firepower of the IXC/CLEC sector. With WorldCom and others under enormous financial constraints, the competitors' ability to utilize a battalion of lawyers,